



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,160	06/21/2001	John Otto Piepenbrink	END920010038US1	5994

23550 7590 04/18/2006

HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC
75 STATE STREET
14TH FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER

THAI, CANG G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/886,160	PIEPENBRINK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cang G. Thai	3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Status of Claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As for claim 1, it is not clear on the querying step and how it would operate to query the record even though if the single record of the relationship information is not located in a specified row or column of the database.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 3629

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US

Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0032599 (CHANDLER ET AL).

As for Claim 1, CHANDLER discloses a computer implemented method for managing a relationship with a venture company, comprising the steps of:

providing venture information from the venture company pertaining to the venture company {Page 1, Paragraph [0013], Lines 4-7, wherein this reads over "the application would provide a series of interactive tools that are useful for each main user; entrepreneurs, investors and corporate alliances, and, professional services and academic institution"};

entering the venture information into a database having a column-row matrix of records, wherein the venture information is entered on a current date {Page 3, Paragraph [0055], Lines 12-13, wherein this reads over "the program receives the data input and stores the data in a server database (Fig. 1a)"}; and

querying a row of the database to provide a single record of relationship information pertaining to the venture company even if the single record of relationship information is not located in a specified row and column of the database {Page 1, Paragraph [0013], Lines 14-17, wherein this reads over "a profile form that the investor completes to use as an electronic search engine that will map and match to potential investment opportunities"}.

wherein the venture company comprises a new business entity that is seeking a relationship with an existing business entity {Page 1, Paragraph [0013], Lines 22-26, wherein this reads over “It also includes logic to transform key information from a sponsor or advertiser into a pre-scripted format that identifies information pertinent to the other users, and logic to profile, map and match needs to capabilities”}.

As for Claim 2, CHANDLER discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

providing scoring data based on the venture information {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 3-6, wherein this reads over “the data entered on the questionnaire is used to give the entrepreneur a score determined by a set of algorithms stored on the server or via an on-line interactive human review and scoring process”}; and

entering the scoring data in the database on the current rate {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 13-16, wherein this reads over “the questionnaire is made available for viewing by another user accessing the web-site to further analyze and review the score”}.

As for Claim 3, CHANDLER discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the venture information comprises a business plan {Page 1, Paragraph [0013], Lines 7-11, wherein this reads over “the entrepreneur may interact with a business planning tool questionnaire that automatically populates a pre-scripted narrative form that is available to download or access electronically, that also may be subjected to a predetermined rating system”}.

As for Claim 4, CHANDLER discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the each row of the matrix corresponds to a separate venture company {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 13-16, wherein this reads over “the questionnaire is made available for viewing by another user accessing the web-site to further analyze and review the score”}, and

wherein each column of the matrix corresponds to a separate time interval {Page 3, Paragraph [0057], Lines 4-7, wherein this reads over “a high score may place the company on a list with other companies that are ready to be matched with capital and a low score may place the company on a review and consulting list”}.

As for Claim 5, CHANDLER discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

duplicating the single record from a first column of the queried row to a second column of the queried row {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 17-20, wherein this reads over “This information can be accessed electronically, via the intranet/extranet/internet, and downloaded into hard copy from their said isolated private storage space”}; and

assigning an updated current date to the duplicated record {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 13-16, wherein this reads over “the questionnaire is made available for viewing by another user accessing the web-site to further analyze and review the score”}.

As for Claim 6, CHANDLER discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of generating reports pertaining to the venture company {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 3-6, wherein this reads over “the data entered on the questionnaire is

Art Unit: 3629

used to give the entrepreneur a score determined by a set of algorithms stored on the server or via an on-line interactive human review and scoring process”}.

As for Claim 7, CHANDLER discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of analyzing a relationship opportunity with the company with the following steps:

identifying the relationship opportunity {Page 3, Paragraph [0055], Lines 12-13, wherein this reads over “The program receives the data input and stores the data in a server database (FIG. 1a)”}.

screening the identified opportunity {Page 3, Paragraph [0055], Lines 14-17, wherein this reads over “the program retrieves the stored input data and populates a table showing the business characteristics (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) of the company”};

evaluating the screened opportunity to determine whether to enter into a business relationship with the venture company {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 3-6, wherein this reads over “the data entered on the questionnaire is used to give the entrepreneur a score determined by a set of algorithms stored on the server or via an on-line interactive human review and scoring process”}; and

deploying the business relationship if the opportunity was positively evaluated {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 6-10, wherein this reads over “The score may include, but is not limited to, the strength of the start-up business with respect to product, resources and business opportunity, and may be a numerical value, for example, between 1 and 100”}.

As for Claim 8, CHANDLER discloses the method of claim 7, wherein the screening step comprises the step of determining scoring data based on the information and wherein the evaluating step comprises the step of determining whether to enter into the business relationship based on the scoring data {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 10-13, wherein this reads over “the system is designed to allow for peer review recommendations to facilitate input regarding opportunities to enhance the entrepreneurial companies business (FIGS. 16, 17)”}.

As for Claim 9, which has the same limitations as in Claims 1, 2 and 5, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claims 1, 2 and 5.

As for Claim 10, which has the same limitations as in Claim 2, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 2.

As for Claim 11, which has the same limitations as in Claim 4, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 4.

As for Claim 12, which has the same limitations as in Claim 7, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 7.

As for Claim 13, which has the same limitations as in Claim 8, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 8.

As for Claim 14, CHANDLER discloses the method for analyzing a relationship opportunity with a venture company, comprising the steps of:

identifying a relationship opportunity with a venture company and obtaining information from the venture company about the venture company {Page 1, Paragraph [0013], Lines 4-7, wherein this reads over “the application would provide a series of

interactive tools that are useful for each main user; entrepreneurs, investors and corporate alliances, and, professional services and academic institution”}.

logging an identification status in a database {Page 3, Paragraph [0055], Lines 6-7, wherein this reads over “the program provides the entrepreneur with a unique login/password”};

calculating scoring data based on the venture information {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 3-6, wherein this reads over “the data entered on the questionnaire is used to give the entrepreneur a score determined by a set of algorithms stored on the server or via an on-line interactive human review and scoring process”};

logging a screening status in the database {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 10-13, wherein this reads over “the system is designed to allow for peer review recommendations to facilitate input regarding opportunities to enhance the entrepreneurial companies business (FIGS. 16, 17)”};

evaluating the scoring data to determine whether to form a business relationship with the venture company {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 6-10, wherein this reads over “The score may include, but is not limited to, the strength of the start-up business with respect to product, resources and business opportunity, and may be a numerical value, for example, between 1 and 100”};

logging an evaluation status in the database {Page 3, Paragraph [0055], Lines 14-17, wherein this reads over “the program retrieves the stored input data and populates a table showing the business characteristics (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) of the company”}; and

deploying the business relationship if the scoring data was positively evaluated {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 13-16, wherein this reads over “the questionnaire is made available for viewing by another user accessing the web-site to further analyze and review the score”}.

wherein the venture company comprises a new business entity that is seeking a relationship with an existing business entity {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 10-13, wherein this reads over “the system is designed to allow for peer review recommendations to facilitate input regarding opportunities to enhance the entrepreneurial companies business (FIGS. 16, 17)”}.

As for Claim 15, CHANDLER discloses a system for managing a relationship with a company, comprising:

a process system for analyzing a relationship opportunity with a venture company {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 3-6, wherein this reads over “the data entered on the questionnaire is used to give the entrepreneur a score determined by a set of algorithms stored on the server or via an on-line interactive human review and scoring process”};

a library system for providing library elements {Page 3, Paragraph [0055], Lines 14-17, wherein this reads over “the program retrieves the stored input data and populates a table showing the business characteristics (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) of the company”}; and

a view system for providing a plurality of views of the process, and the elements {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 10-13, wherein this reads over “the system is

Art Unit: 3629

designed to allow for peer review recommendations to facilitate input regarding opportunities to enhance the entrepreneurial companies business (FIGS. 16, 17)"}.

wherein the venture company comprises a new business entity that is seeking a relationship with an existing business entity {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 6-10, wherein this reads over "The score may include, but is not limited to, the strength of the start-up business with respect to product, resources and business opportunity, and may be a numerical value, for example, between 1 and 100"}.

As for Claim 16, which has the same limitations as in Claim 12, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 12.

As for Claim 17, CHANDLER discloses the system of claim 15, wherein the library system comprises:

a reference system for providing reference documentation {Page 1, Paragraph [0013], Lines 14-17, wherein this reads over "a profile form that the investor completes to use as an electronic search engine that will map and match to potential investment opportunities"};

a template system for providing templates {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 13-16, wherein this reads over "he questionnaire is made available for viewing by another user accessing the web-site to further analyze and review the score"}; and

a screening tool system for providing venture information about the venture company {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 10-13, wherein this reads over "the system is designed to allow for peer review recommendations to facilitate input regarding opportunities to enhance the entrepreneurial companies business (FIGS. 16, 17)"}.

As for Claim 18, CHANDLER discloses the system of claim 15, further comprising a database system for managing relationship information corresponding to the process, wherein the database system comprises:

a database comprising a column-row matrix of records, wherein each row correspond to a separate venture company and each column corresponds to a separate time interval {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 13-16, wherein this reads over “the questionnaire is made available for viewing by another user accessing the web-site to further analyze and review the score”}.

a row query system for querying a row of the matrix to provide a single record of relationship information corresponding to a particular venture company at a predetermined time interval even if the single record of relationship information is not located in a specified row and column of the database {Page 1, Paragraph [0013], Lines 14-17, wherein this reads over “a profile form that the investor completes to use as an electronic search engine that will map and match to potential investment opportunities”}.

a duplication system for duplicating a provided single record from a first column of a queried row to a second column of the queried row {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 17-20, wherein this reads over “This information can be accessed electronically, via the intranet/extranet/internet, and downloaded into hard copy from their said isolated private storage space”}; and

a dating system for assigning an updated current date to a duplicated record {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 13-16, wherein this reads over “he questionnaire is

made available for viewing by another user accessing the web-site to further analyze and review the score”}.

As for Claim 19, CHANDLER discloses the system of claim 18, wherein the view system further provides a plurality of views of the relationship information {Page 3, Paragraph [0056], Lines 10-13, wherein this reads over “the system is designed to allow for peer review recommendations to facilitate input regarding opportunities to enhance the entrepreneurial companies business (FIGS. 16, 17)”}.

As for Claim 20, CHANDLER discloses the system of claim 18, wherein the relationship information comprises status information {Page 3, Paragraph [0057], Lines 4-7, wherein this reads over “a high score may place the company on a list with other companies that are ready to be matched with capital and a low score may place the company on a review and consulting list”}.

As for Claim 21, which has the same limitations as in Claim 15, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 15.

As for Claim 22, which has the same limitations as in Claim 16, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 16.

As for Claim 23, which has the same limitations as in Claim 17, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 17.

As for Claim 24, which has the same limitations as in Claim 18, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 18.

As for Claim 25, which has the same limitations as in Claim 19, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 19.

As for Claim 26, which has the same limitations as in Claims 21 and 24, respectively, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claims 21 and 24, respectively.

As for Claims 27 and 28, which have the same limitations as in Claim 18, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 18.

As for Claim 29, which has the same limitations as in Claims 19 and 20, respectively, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claims 19 and 20, respectively.

As for Claim 30, which has the same limitations as in Claim 24, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 24.

As for Claim 31, which has the same limitations as in Claims 19 and 20, respectively, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 19 and 20, respectively.

As for Claim 32, which has the same limitations as in Claim 21, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 21.

As for Claim 33, which has the same limitations as in Claim 22, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 22.

As for Claim 34, which has the same limitations as in Claim 23, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 23.

As for Claim 35, which has the same limitations as in Claim 24, therefore, it is rejected for the similar set forth in Claim 24.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

I. U.S. Patent:


- 1) U.S. Patent No. 6,671,673 (BASEMAN ET AL) is cited to teach method for integrated supply chain and financial management,
- 2) U.S. Patent No. 6,067,537 (O'CONNOR ET AL) is cited to teach system, method and article of manufacture for a goal based educational system with support for dynamic personality feedback,
- 3) U.S. Patent No. 5,220,500 (BAIRD ET AL) is cited to teach financial management system, and
- 4) U.S. Patent No. 5,953,707 (HUANG ET AL) is cited to teach decision support system for the management of an agile supply chain.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cang (James) G. Thai whose telephone number is (571) 272-6499. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CGT
03/07/2006



ERIC W. STAMBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600